

**REMARKS**

Receipt of the Office Action of September 15, 2009 is gratefully acknowledged.

Claims 7 - 12 have been examined again in this RCE application, and have been rejected over a new combination of references, namely under 35 USC 103(a) over Cheng et al (previously cited) in view of Spring et al (newly cited).

The combination off Cheng et al and Spring et al has been carefully considered. Applicants believe, however, that the present invention patentably distinguishes over the proposed combination. Accordingly, the noted rejection is respectfully traversed.

\*\*\*\*\*

The invention influences process variables in process automation technology which employs field devices connected to a company network vis a data bus and a gateway. Several workstations are connected to the firm network, and any one of them can query the field devices, and if the feed back from the field device being queried does not show a proper functionality, then the workstation downloads the proper functionality (preconfiguration) from a storing device(central server) via the internet.

Independent claim 7 has been further amended better define the invention by noting that the actual device descriptions has been changed to preconfigured device descriptions, and that these preconfigured device descriptions are downloaded frm the storing device via the internet when needed.

On pages 3 and 4 of the Office Action, we note the examiner's application of Cheng et al and Spring et al. against claim 7. The examiner suggests that the networks 150<sup>1</sup>, 170<sup>1</sup> and 201 are the equivalent of the field devices with the preconfigured device descriptions. Applicants cannot agree. There is certainly use of the internet disclosed, and there certainly are controlled devices, but the interrelations of these components

U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/522,586

and the control afforded by the method claimed are not the same. One should not be confused because there are some components in the prior art that are also found in the invention. The method as recited is the important consideration, and when one views the various method steps together, it becomes evident that the combination proposed does not meet the steps recited.

Reconsideration and reexamination is respectfully requested and remaining claims 7 - 9 and 11 found allowable.

Date: December 15, 2009

Respectfully submitted,  
BACON & THOMAS, PLLC



Felix J. D'Ambrosio  
*Attorney for Applicant*

Registration Number 25,721

**Customer Number \*23364\***  
**BACON & THOMAS, PLLC**  
625 Slaters Lane, Fourth Floor  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314  
Telephone: (703) 683-0500  
Facsimile: (703) 683-1080

S:\Producer\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\SEGE3003 - EH0556\Dec 15, 2009 response.wpd